

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants again thank the Examiner for the indication that the pending claims are free of the prior art.

In the instant application claims 1-14 were pending. Claims 6-8 and 10 have been amended. Amendments to the claims are matters of form, and are made in the interest of expediting prosecution. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification and claims as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

Cancellation and/or amendment of the claims should in no way be construed as acquiescence to the rejections. The cancellation and/or amendment of the claims are being made solely to expedite prosecution of the above-identified application. Applicants reserve the option to further prosecute the same or similar claims in the present or another patent application. The cancellation and/or amendment of the claims are not related to issues of patentability.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 6, 8 and 10-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention.

Claim 6 and 14

The Office Action indicates that claims 6 and 14 are allegedly confusing by being “unclear where the surrounding material is located, what the surrounding material surrounds and material that is a surrounding material.”

Applicants respectfully submit that, when read in light of the specification, the phrase “a surrounding material” is readily understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art. Specifically, the specification (*e.g.*, Section 3, first paragraph, Section 4, second paragraph and Section 5, third paragraph) indicate that the surrounding material is the medium in the water treatment plant, bioreactor or fermentation reactor, in which the claimed composite material is suspended. Moreover, these passages also make it clear that the surrounding material surrounds the claimed

composite material. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the “surrounding material” is clear and unambiguous.

Claim 8

The Office Action indicates that claim 8 is allegedly unclear as to how the plastics powder differs from the plastics particles of claim 1. As a preliminary matter, Applicants respectfully note that claim 8 is a method claim. Accordingly, this claim is to be clearly distinguished from the composition of claim 1. Thus, even if the plastics powder of claim 8 is identical to a plastics particle as defined in claim 1, the recitation in claim 8 of “adding” the plastics particles to the mixture clearly distinguishes claim 8 from claim 7, as well as from claim 1.

In addition, claim 8 has been amended to clarify that it is a method “further comprising adding an additional plastics powder...” Applicants respectfully note that the amendment to include the word “additional” is made solely in the interest of expediting prosecution and it is noted that this amendment should not be construed as eliminating the possibility that the “additional plastics powder” has a chemical structure that is similar or identical to the plastics particles. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is clear and definite.

Claims 10-14

The Office Action indicates that claim 10 and claims dependent therefrom are allegedly unclear because of the recitation of the phrase “wherein the composite material is a bacteria carrier material.” Applicants respectfully note that claim 10 has been amended as suggested in the Office Action in order to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present rejection has been rendered moot. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In view of the above arguments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6, 8 and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

SUMMARY

It is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining issues or the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorney would be helpful in expediting prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (617) 449 6536.

Applicants believe no fee is due with this statement. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-4876, under Order No. 117814-02101 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw

Date: September 7, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By /A. Jacqueline Wizeman/
A. Jacqueline Wizeman, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 62,307
McCarter & English LLP
Attorneys at Law
265 Franklin Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
Direct: 617-449-6536
Fax: 617-206-9412
Attorney for Applicant